

REMARKS

The present application has pending claims 20-35.

Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone to schedule an interview to discuss the issues of the present application prior to examination. There appears to be a misunderstanding about the language used in the claims and the features of the present invention.

Claims 20-35 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita (U.S. Patent No. 5,397,883) in view of Sehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,976). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 20-32 are not taught or suggested by Miyashita or Sehr whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

As previously discussed the present invention is directed to a ticket examiner for examining a ticket including a ticket slot into which the ticket is entered, a pick-up port for ejecting a ticket, a controller, a first antenna covering a long distance service area, a second antenna covering a nearby service area and a communication module which sends a call to a medium of a user, the communication module stopping calling to the user medium in response to entry of the ticket into the ticket slot.

According to the present invention the controller, in response to detection of the user medium by receiving a response to the call at the communication module through the first antenna, receives information of the

ticket from the user medium through the first antenna and the communication module, requests authentication of the ticket information to a center apparatus, generates printing data based on the ticket information in response to result of the reference that the ticket is valid, and stores the printing data in the controller.

Further, according to the present invention the controller, in response to detection of the user medium by receiving at the communication module the response to the call through the second antenna, prints the printing data stored on the controller on a slip using a printer to transport the printed slip to the pick-up port.

By use of the above described features of the present invention, the controller of the ticket examiner, in response to detection of the user medium through the first antenna covering a long-distance service area, can start preparation of printing of a ticket in advanced. As a result, the ticket can be rapidly printed without delay when the user passes through the ticket examiner.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by Miyashita or Sehr whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Numerous arguments were presented distinguishing the features of the present invention as recited in the claims from the teachings of Miyashita and

Sehr in the Remarks of the February 21, 2006 Amendment and the Remarks of the August 9, 2006 Amendment, each of said Remarks being incorporated herein by reference.

As previously discussed, Miyashita discloses an automatic ticket examining apparatus (examiner) which is capable of handling both of a magnetic ticket and a wireless ticket.

The ticket examiner defined in claim 20 of the present application corresponds to the automatic ticket examiner 10 in Miyashita. A ticket slot and a pickup port (ejector) correspond to Miyashita's ticket slot 14 and ticket outlet 16, respectively. Either one of Applicants' first and second antennas correspond to a radio antenna 98 in Miyashita. Applicants' controller corresponds to Miyashita's controller 41.

Miyashita discloses that when taking in of a magnetic commuter pass 12 into a ticket slot 14 is detected at the magnetic ticket sensing circuit 54 on the basis of the output of the sensor 20 (step S6), a message on a display unit 92 is erased or a message "not accepted" is displayed thereon, thus informing a passenger possessing the magnetic commuter pass of the fact that the radio commuter pass can not be accepted (step S7). However, Miyashita does not disclose to stop calling to the radio commuter pass anywhere.

Therefore, Miyashita does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention wherein the communication module, in response to entry of the ticket into the ticket slot, stops calling to the user medium.

Miyashita discloses one radio antenna 98, but not disclose a plurality of radio antennas of which the covering service areas are different from each

other. Thus, Miyashita does not teach or suggest both of the first and second antennas as defined in the claims of the present application.

Further, Miyashita does not teach or suggest preparation of printing regarding the radio commuter pass in response to detection of the radio commuter pass by receiving a response to a call to the radio commuter pass through an antenna covering a long-distance service area because plural antennas as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Miyashita discloses storing necessary information on the radio commuter pass and opening a door portion 40 as handling for radio commuter pass. However, Miyashita does not teach or suggest that the automatic gate apparatus prints information on a slip based receipt of a response to a call to the radio commuter on an antenna covering a nearby area.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Miyashita.

Referring to the Examiner's Response to Applicants' Arguments, the Examiner alleges that a person sensor 81 in Miyashita corresponds to Applicants' first antenna (92a) covering a long-distance service area; and the antenna disposed on a surface of the ticket examiner 91 corresponds to Applicants' second antenna (92b) covering a nearby service area. Applicants do not agree.

The cited person sensor 81 as taught by Miyashita can detect a person, but cannot communicate, for example, with a wireless commuter pass wirelessly as in the present invention. In the present invention, Applicants' first antenna (92a) can send a call to a medium of a user, and can receive a

response to the call from the user medium to thereby receive information of the ticket being held by the user medium. No similar function can be performed by Miyashita.

Therefore, Miyashita's person sensor 81 is entirely different from Applicants' first antenna (92a) covering a long-distance service area as recited in the claims. Accordingly, Miyashita does not teach or suggest the first antenna as recited in Applicants' claim 20 and as such does not teach or suggest a plurality of antennas including the first and second antennas for performing long distance and nearby service area communications as recited in the claims.

It should be understood that the cited person sensor 81 of Miyashita seems to more closely correspond to a sensor as recited in Applicants' claims 21 and 22. Moreover, Miyashita's proximity sensor 94 corresponds to a sensor as defined Applicants' claims 21 -22 because it is not capable of communicating with a wireless commuter pass.

Thus, Miyashita does not teach or suggest the first and second antennas as recited in the claims, and as such accordingly, fails to teach or suggest preparation of printing, for example, information concerning a wireless commuter pass when the wireless(radio) commuter pass is sensed through the long-distance service area antenna and through the nearby service area antennas upon receipt of a response to a call to the radio commuter pass as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Further, at no point in the Office Action has the Examiner addressed the previous argument that Miyashita fails to teach or suggest that the controller causes the communication module to stop calling to the radio

commuter pass upon entry of the ticket into the ticket slot as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Miyashita merely discloses that when taking in information of a magnetic commuter pass 12 into a ticket slot 14 as detected at the magnetic ticket sensing circuit 54 based on the output of the sensor 20 (step S6), a message on a display unit 92 is erased or a message "not accepted" is displayed thereon. This displaying function as taught by Miyashita merely informs a passenger possessing the magnetic commuter pass of the fact that the radio commuter pass can not be accepted (step S7). This teaching of Miyashita fails to teach or suggest and certainly does not address the limitations as recited in the claims that the controller causes the communication module to stop calling to the radio commuter pass upon entry of the ticket into the ticket slot.

According to the Examiner's detailed action, The Examiner alleges that Applicants' first antenna 91a for covering a long distance service area corresponds to a proximity sensor 94 in Miyashita. Applicants' second antenna 92b for covering a nearby service area corresponds to a radio antenna 98 in Miyashita.

Miyashita definitely discloses that the proximity sensor 94 is capable of detecting the approach of a user or a radio commuter pass. However, Miyashita does not teach or suggest that the proximity sensor 94 is capable of receiving and transmitting the radio commuter pass and information. In other words, since the proximity sensor 94 of Miyashita is not an antenna, the sensor is not capable of receiving and transmitting the radio commuter pass and the information as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Miyashita's proximity sensor 94 differs from the first antenna 92a of the present invention that is capable of receiving and transmitting a user medium and information (call or information of the ticket) as recited in claim 20.

Even if Miyashita's proximity sensor 94 is presumed to correspond to the first antenna 92a defined in Applicants' claim 20, Miyashita does not teach or suggest that the controller, in response to detection of the user medium by receiving a response to said call at the communication module through the first antenna, receives information of the ticket from the user medium through said first antenna and said communication module as in the present invention as recited in claim 20, of the present application. This is overwhelmingly evident being that Miyashita's proximity sensor 94 is not capable of receiving and transmitting the radio commuter pass and information as in the first antenna 92a of the present invention as recited in the claims.

In the Office Action on page 4 the Examiner alleges that the same reasoning as applied to claims 20 is also applied to claims 24-29 and 31-32.

However, Miyashita, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record, namely Sehr, does not teach or suggest the features defined in claims 25 and 26 particularly with regard to the use of a synchronizing clock. Further, neither Miyashita nor Sehr teach or suggest any of the other limitations as recited in claims 25 and 26. Therefore, Applicants strongly assert that the Examiner's arguments with respect to claims 25 and 26 are entirely in error and unsustainable.

Claim 31 defines to transmit voice data to a user medium from a ticket examiner or ticket selling machine. This feature of the present invention is not taught or suggested by either of Miyashita and Sehr.

The Examiner contends that claim 34 defines the communication module includes a base-band control module connected to the first antenna and the second antenna. The claimed base-band control module (91) is similar to Miyashita transmitter/receiver 99. However, the transmitter/receiver 99 of Miyashita is connected to only the radio antenna 98, which corresponds to Applicants' second antenna, but is not connected to the proximity sensor 94, which the Examiner misinterprets as corresponding to Applicants' first antenna. Refer to Fig. 5 of Miyashita. However, the proximity sensor 94 of Miyashita is not an antenna and hence need not be connected to the transmitter/receiver 99 or the base-band control module so as to be equivalent to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. It should be noted that claim 34 defines that the base-band control module is connected to the second antenna, but not the first antenna. Therefore, the Examiner's allegation regarding this issue is entirely incorrect.

Regarding claim 35, the claimed timer corresponds to Miyashita's timer 95-2. In the Office Action the Examiner contends that Miyashita teaches the system further comprising a timer (Fig.5, item 95-2), wherein the communication module starts detection of the user medium through the second antenna in response to a lapse of a predetermined period of time by the timer (Fig.6, item S13, S15, S17, S12, C.6,L.46-49). However, Miyashita discloses the manner of using a timer 95-2 which is different from that of Applicants' timer. Therefore, Miyashita, Fig.6, item S13, S15, S17, S12, C.6,

L.46-49 is apparently not applicable to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, Miyashita fails to teach or suggest a ticket examiner having a first antenna covering a long distance service area and a second antenna covering a nearby service area as recited in the claims.

Further, Miyashita fails to teach or suggest a communication module which sends a call to a medium of a user, the communication module stopping calling to the user medium in response to the entry of the ticket into the ticket slot as recited in the claims.

Still further, Miyashita fails to teach or suggest that the controller in response to detection of the user medium by receiving a response to the call at the communication module through the first antenna, receives information of the ticket from the user medium through the first antenna and the communication module, requests authentication of the ticket to a ticket center apparatus, generates printing data based on the ticket information in response to result of the reference that the ticket is valid, and stores the printed data in the controller as recited in the claims.

Still further yet, Miyashita fails to teach or suggest that the controller in response to detection of the user medium by receiving at the communication module in response to the call through the second antenna, prints the printing data stored on the controller on a slip using a printer to transport the printed slip to the pick-up port as recited in the claims.

The above described deficiencies of Miyashita are not supplied by any of the other references of record. Particularly, the above described deficiencies of Miyashita are not supplied by Sehr. Therefore, combining the

teachings of Miyashita and Sehr in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Sehr merely discloses a traveling service providing using a multi-application passenger card. Sehr teaches that the printing of data on a slip using a printer allows the user to print out hard copies including paper based documents such as travel statements and expense report as needed.

However, Sehr does not teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention shown above not to be taught or suggested by Miyashita.

Thus, Sehr does not teach or suggest an examiner having first and second antennas, wherein the first antenna covers a long distance service area and the second antenna covers a nearby service area, and a communication module which sends a call to a medium of the user such that the communication module stops calling to the user medium in response to entry of the ticket into the ticket slot as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sehr that the controller in response to the receipt of a response to a call to the user medium, receives information of the ticket from the user medium, requests authentication of the ticket information to a ticket center, generates printing data based on the ticket information and stores the printing data as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

In Sehr, there is a printing of data. However, this printing of data does not occur in response to the above described functions as now more clearly

recited in the claims. Particularly, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Sehr that printing occurs in response to detection of the user medium by receiving a response to a call to the user medium wherein the response to the call is received at the communication module through the first antenna as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

In addition, in the present invention as recited in the claims the information as received through the first antenna is authenticated to a center apparatus. Such a teaching cannot be found at any point in Sehr.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sehr that a second antenna is provided which upon the detection of the user data by receiving at the second antenna a response to the call, prints the printing data stored in the controller on a slip as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

As is clear from the above, Sehr the same as Miyashita suffers from the same deficiencies described above as Miyashita relative to the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, since Sehr does not supply any of the deficiencies of Miyashita relative to the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, combining the teachings of Miyashita and Sehr in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 20-35 as being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Sehr is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 20-35.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 20-35 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 20-35 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.40214X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120